MODERN SOCIALISM

A Journal of Revolutionary Re-Education

★ SUMMER, 1942 ★

SOCIALISM AND THE WAR

BRITISH TRADE UNIONISM:
A Revolutionary Perspective
By WALTER PADLEY

THE ROLE OF THE PARTY
By F. A. RIDLEY

PSYCHOLOGY VERSUS MARXISM
By ABRAHAM ZIEGLER

25 Cents a Copy

"MODERN SOCIALISM" BOWS TO MILITARY CALL

The undersigned having received notice [as this last page was about to be printed] of his classification in Class 1A and his imminent induction into the armed forces of the United States, announces the suspension of MODERN SOCIALISM *for the duration or such period as, when and if he returns once more to civil life.*

We will not enter the military service as a cringing slave driven by the whip, but firmly convinced of the paramount importance of supporting and participating (according to ability and capacity) in the military struggle against the Axis Powers. At the same time we are far from renouncing our Marxist, revolutionary convictions. In retiring from the active work of Marxist education we by no means relinquish our immediate and continuing interest in Marxism. We will, in keeping with our altered circumstances, concretely manifest this interest by supporting existing organs of Marxist education and expression. It is our earnest and devout hope that those who are left behind will not prove unmindful of their right, privilege and duty of carrying on the political class struggle for Socialism, and supporting to the best of their ability the remaining organs of Marxist expression.

ONLY SOCIALISM CAN WIN THE PEACE FOR HUMANITY!

ABRAHAM ZIEGLER.

MODERN SOCIALISM

A CRITICAL MARXIST QUARTERLY

VOLUME I, NUMBER 4 SUMMER, 1942

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

"MODERN SOCIALISM" COMPLETES VOLUME I..... 2

"MODERN SOCIALISM" AND THE WAR..... 3

ARTICLES

PSYCHOLOGY VERSUS MARXISM..... 5
By ABRAHAM ZIEGLER

THE ROLE OF THE PARTY (Discussion Continued)
THE PARTY "AGAINST" THE CLASS..... 10
By F. A. RIDLEY

IN REPLY TO RIDLEY..... 28

"CAPITALIST" PROPERTY IN GERMANY..... 15
By ABRAHAM ZIEGLER

BRITISH TRADE UNIONISM: A REVOLUTIONARY PERSPECTIVE 23
By WALTER PADLEY

HOW DEAD IS GERMAN CAPITALISM?..... 30
By FRED DYER

EDITORIAL REJOINDER

A SECTARIAN MARXIST DISSECTED..... 33

Editor and Publisher, ABRAHAM ZIEGLER

MODERN SOCIALISM is published at 140 Fourth Ave., Brooklyn, New York. Manuscripts representing all viewpoints are solicited.
Subscription: $1.00 *yearly; Canada,* $1.35; *foreign,* $1.50

Composed by Union Labor and printed by Voluntary Labor in U. S. A.

"MODERN SOCIALISM"—VOLUME I

With this issue MODERN SOCIALISM completes Volume One. MODERN SOCIALISM made its appearance at a period of the lowest ebb of working class activity and Socialist interest in the history of the Socialist movement of this country. Unfortunately, the past year has witnessed no revival, the movement remains in the doldrums, with the interest in Marxist education but sporadic. To have maintained an uninterrupted publication schedule under such circumstances is in itself an accomplishment.

MODERN SOCIALISM entered the lists as a "Journal of Revolutionary Re-Education" free from paralyzing, partisan entanglements. It set itself the task of meeting the challenge presented by the crumbling Socialist movement, the impotent working class (to whom Socialists had traditionally looked as the "saviours" of society), and the onsweeping, victorious, counter-revolutionary, Fascist new order.

MODERN SOCIALISM takes pride in the fact that irrespective of the quality of the answers it has offered to these burning tactical questions it has proved itself in actual practice to be an organ of "Living" Marxism. It has not flinched from meeting the new issues presented by the changing objective conditions of a changing, decadant, capitalist world; a world which Marx never contemplated. Above all, MODERN SOCIALISM has thought out these new problems down to the roots, and has not recoiled at accepting and announcing their inescapable conclusions, regardless of how drastic their character or how sweeping their conflict with preconceived notions. This course has led us to new positions which we ourselves would have deemed incredible and hotly denounced as rank treason but a short time ago. But in the conflict between the faith of doctrinaire Marxism and the science of Marxism we have taken our stand with science and followed its lead. Marxism would not be Marxism if it could not rise above the mire which traditional, tactical Marxism had led it into.

The world situation is ripe for historical developments of the most far reaching consequence. It is not beyond the bounds of possibility that the coming year may well prove to be a turning point. Now as never before is there a need for an organ of "Living" Marxism, alive to the burning issues of the day, probing and presenting them with intellectual courage and integrity in the light of Marxist science. To this vital and glorious task, MODERN SOCIALISM dedicates itself for the coming, second year of its publication.

The occasion demands that the Editor and Publisher here publicly express his heartfelt acknowledgment to the small group of comrades and co-workers without whose full cooperation—financially, editorially and printing—and sympathetic understanding, it would have been impossible to launch MODERN SOCIALISM and complete its first year of uninterrupted, scheduled publication. They really made MODERN SOCIALISM possible.

ABRAHAM ZIEGLER,
Editor and Publisher.

"MODERN SOCIALISM" AND THE WAR

MODERN SOCIALISM marked its inception by breaking with the traditional war position of sectarian Marxism. Our analyses of the nature of Nazism and its real and immediate threat against the continued existence of a free working class movement led us to proclaim the necessity for full support of the military struggle against the Axis powers while at the same time maintaining and continuing the political class struggle against Capitalism and its class rule.

As the war moves on with increasing tempo, subsequent developments have in no way changed our conviction that Nazism is the main and immediate enemy of the working class and as such must be destroyed at the roots. There can be, there must be no peace with Nazism short of its complete annihilation. At the same time, in view of certain currents emanating from high official quarters which are becoming increasingly stronger, it becomes necessary for us to reiterate the Socialist position on war and the necessity of waging along side with our full support of the military struggle against the Axis powers, the political class struggle against Capitalism and its class rule.

Much ado is being made in liberal circles and the press led by the enterprising *PM* of New York, about the now famous "people's revolution" address delivered by Vice-President Wallace. The theme of the Wallace speech was that the war was being fought as a people's revolution to establish freedom everywhere and create "a brave new world." In a subsequent address Wallace re-affirmed his peace theme of a people's revolution and stated that America fights to free the world from the blight of imperialistic intervention. Other high officials, including Undersecretary of State Sumner Wells and Donald Nelson, have followed with public utterances in the Wallace vein. Ever since, the liberals accepting these semi-official pronouncements as solid coin, have been busy celebrating in advance, these people's peace aims.

MODERN SOCIALISM refuses to join this "victory" procession, which blandly proclaims the emergence after the war of a benevolent and reformed Capitalism shorn of all imperialist propensities. Our understanding of the necessity of militarily crushing Nazism and the Axis powers does not blind us to the real nature of Capitalism and the realities of this war. This is a war which in the first place has its roots in the social character of Nazism, *but Nazism itself is a bastard offspring of decadent Capitalist society.* To forget or overlook this truth is to render futile our support of the military struggle against Nazism. We can not, we dare not forget, if we mean to win the peace, that Nazism received the full and fraternal support of British-United States Imperialism as long as it refrained from challenging its dominant position. This is not a war to create "a brave new world." This is a war for Capitalist survival, to preserve and perpetuate the social order of Capitalism. No amount of official pronouncements from whatever source

can alter this inescapable, fundamental premise. And Capitalism, New Deal reformed or otherwise, if it is permitted to perpetuate itself after the war, cannot, it is constitutionally incapable of establishing, even with the best good will in the world, a "brave new world" with freedom everywhere. Decadent Capitalism can only perpetuate itself at the cost of sacrificing freedom. For it to permit freedom and liberty to be continued, let alone extended, is to invite disaster. History has proven that no ruling class has ever voluntarily surrendered and abdicated its power and special class privileges. What reason have we to expect that the British and American ruling class will prove to be an exception to this historical law. Britain's reaction to India's demand for independance, during the recent crisis, is highly instructive in this connection. In the face of an imminent Japanese invasion of India, Britain was confronted with two alternatives. It could grant the Indian rightful demand for independence and thereby strike a two-fold mighty blow for victory against the Axis powers by enlisting wholeheartedly in the struggle the 300,000,000 Indian masses and the vast material resources of India, and at the same time deprive the Japanese Fascists of their most powerful ideological weapon, worth a dozen divisions, naval and aerial detachments to them, *i.e.*, that Atlantic Charters are not for the East* and that British-United States Imperialism is determined to keep the people of the East in imperialist subjugation. Or it could, by refusing Indian independence, play directly into the hands of the Japanese, strengthen their ideological position, and possibly seal the conquest of India, thereby prolonging the war. British Imperialism decided to stand pat. In refusing to grant Indian independence Britain showed where its real interest in this war lay. The British were enboldened to risk the loss of India because of their confidence of ultimate victory, which would restore India to them with their imperialist prerogatives unimpaired. MODERN SOCIALISM, in supporting the military struggle against the Axis powers, is not doing so to help perpetuate British-United States Imperialism and that of its junior Dutch partner in Java.

It is because of this that we must at all times remember that the military defeat and destruction of Nazism, vitally necessary as it is, is but half the battle and the smallest half at that. If the peace is to be won for Humanity, and not for the ruling classes and their selfish class interests, it is necessary to go beyond the destruction of Nazism and its detestable Hitler régime, it is necessary to go the whole hog and destroy its evil genius and foster parent—decadent Capitalism.

In this crucial period of working class history six months after America's official entry into the war, MODERN SOCIALISM reaffirms the cardinal necessity of carrying on the political class struggle for Socialism side by side with the unavoidable duty of supporting the military struggle against the Axis powers.

Defeating Nazism is only half the battle—only Socialism can win the peace for Humanity.

* Churchill has stated that the Atlantic Charter does not apply to India.

PSYCHOLOGY VERSUS MARXISM

By ABRAHAM ZIEGLER

In recent years psychology has been used with increasing frequency as a weapon in the struggle against Marxism. Psychology, social psychology, and sociology—which is closely akin to both—reject Marxism. This is not at all surprising inasmuch as all three are essentially bourgeois sciences attempting to solve the social problem outside and independently of the class struggle and the class forces operating within bourgeois society. While psychology is divided into conflicting and contending schools and methodologies, all schools of psychological and sociological thought agree in rejecting the Marxian concept of the class struggle as the driving force of all history since primitive society. All of them look to the *individual* and not the *class* as the basic historical entity and proceed from the premise that the psychological factor, in varying degrees, is the mould shaping human history. Thus, while Marxism teaches that it is the productive forces, the economic relations of a given society and the class divisions that result from the development of these forces which are the primary agents of social change, psychology and sociology on the other hand stress the role of the isolated individual or at best the group as a socio-psychological phenomenon as opposed to the class as a socio-economic force as the dominant influence in the social process.

This conflict between the Marxist class struggle concept and the bourgeois individual-entity-psychical drive conception of history is brought out in bold relief by a recent work.[1] *Escape from Freedom* has been favorably received both in representative bourgeois and Marxist circles. Dwight MacDonald, writing in *Common Sense*,[2] rapturously greets it as a work of the "greatest importance" which in his estimation introduced "a new dimension into our usual conception of society: to the economic and political dimensions Fromm has added the psychological." Continues MacDonald:

> "This is an attempt at 'social psychology'; that is, at applying some of the discoveries about the way individual human beings behave which have been made by Freud and his followers (and antagonists)—applying these to the behavior of men in social and national groups. There have been attempts at this before—to synthesize Freud and Marx, so to speak—but this is the first time on any large scale which has seemed to me at all successful."

If substantiated, this contribution would represent an important development—and since MODERN SOCIALISM is devoted to a re-examination of the basic premises of Marxism in the light of present-day scientific and historical developments, we have made a thorough and painstaking study of *Escape from Freedom* and its viewpoint. It is our considered judgment that Macdonald has permitted his enthusiasm to warp his own critical judgment. Fromm's

[1] *Escape from Freedom*, by Erich Fromm. Farrar & Rinehart, New York ($2.50).
[2] January, 1942.

attempt to establish a "fourth dimension" in our conception of modern society and historical interpretation in the shape of independent and primary psychical drives, must be dismissed as a complete and dismal failure upon the basis of his own evidence. Although Fromm does postulate new historical factors in the form of psychological drives, these new forces only serve to re-introduce (by the back door) the old discredited idealist (the primacy of ideas) interpretation which Marxism was instrumental in dislodging from history.

While Fromm's specific formulation of psychological drives as independent and primary historical forces must be rejected as lacking scientific and historical validity, his work as a whole is by no means without value. It possesses a decided negative value in refuting the instinct school of psychology which attributes to human nature innate, anti-social possessive, acquisitive instincts which makes impossible the introduction of Socialism.[3] It also possesses value in challenging the Freudian conception of human nature as a fixed, unchangeable biological quality which views the individual as a "closed system endowed by nature with certain psychological conditioned drives and only secondarily in need of society and social relations."

Fromm rejects the purely biological conception of human nature,[4] but at the same time he does not accept the Marxian view that human nature is exclusively a social, historical product.[5] While conceding that human nature is historically conditioned he nevertheless adds the caveat that there are certain innate biological (psychological) elements inherent in human nature, which operate as primary drives in the social process.

> ". . . Although there is no fixed human nature, human nature has a dynamism of its own that constitutes an active (*i.e.*, independent, A. Z.) factor in the evolution of the social process." (Page 289.)
>
> "While it is true that man is moulded by the necessities of the economic and social structure of society, he is not infinitely adaptable. Not only are there certain physiological needs that imperatively call for satisfaction, but there are also certain psychological qualities inherent in man that need to be satisfied and result in certain reactions if they are frustrated." (Page 277.)

---

[3] Fromm is a pupil and critical follower of Freud; at the same time he is a recognized psychologist of standing in his own right and he writes with authority. *Escape from Freedom* definitely disposes of the psychological pretensions of Max Eastman and the psychological warfare that doughty warrior is waging against Marxism. Fromm writes with the greatest respect for the historical contributions of Marx. In view of the fact that Eastman attacks Marxism as unscientific because allegedly Marx failed to take psychological drives into consideration in evaluating social forces, it is interesting to note that Fromm pays tribute to Marx and credits him "with having laid down the foundations for understanding the problems of alienation" (the central theme of psychology—A. Z.). *Cf.* in particular Marx's concept of the "fetishism of commodities" and of the "alienation of labor" (p. 119). The joke is on Max Eastman.

[4] Human nature "is essentially historically conditioned" (p. 290). "There is no fixed human nature" (p. 15).

[5] ". . . The human essence is no abstraction inherent in each single individual. In its reality it is the *ensemble* of the social relations. . . . The abstract individual . . . belongs in reality to a particular form of society."—Marx's *Thesis on Feurbach*, Nos. 6 and 7.

These psychological needs Fromm describes as "the need to be related to the world outside oneself and the need to avoid moral aloneness and isolation."

> "This relatedness to others is not identical with physical contact. An individual may be alone in a physical sense for many years and yet he may be related to idea values or at least social patterns, that give him a feeling of communion and 'belonging.' On the other hand he may live among other people and yet be overcome with a feeling of utter isolation. . . ." (Page 19.)

Fromm continues:

> "The individual may or may not be conscious of these drives, but in any case they are forceful and demand satisfaction once they have developed. They become powerful forces which in their turn become effective in moulding the social process. How economic, psychological and ideological factors interact and what further general conclusion concerning this interaction one can make will be discussed later in the course of our analysis of the Reformation and Fascism." (Page 22.)

Before following Fromm in his analysis of the historical and social phenomenon of Reformation and Fascism, which must after all be the "proof of the pudding," for his particular theory, it is necessary to consider in passing the relation of these psychological drives to the social process. It cannot be denied that the biological (psychical) factors enumerated by Fromm, are real and scientific forces which must be probed and interpreted, but their field is not history and they do not represent historical causative factors. It is of course elementary that man is a social animal and that the drive to cooperate and band together in groups and in society is an innate biological drive of the human being. The urge to avoid moral aloneness and isolation is a recognized deeply rooted need which leads to the destruction of reason if its satisfaction is unduly frustrated. But these psychological elements merely inform us why society was established in the first place, they offer no assistance in enlightening us as to the nature of and the course of the specific social forces *after* society is once established. Fromm is attempting to blend the field of biology and psychology (the study of individual consciousness) with history. He has no more warrant in doing so than would a chemist have in postulating a chemical interpretation of history and advancing chemistry as an independent, primary factor in historical causation because, forsooth, the body of man is composed of certain innate chemical properties and without the possession of these particular chemical properties man could not exist and society and history would be impossible! Fromm asks the question, what is freedom? He proceeds to point out that the urge for freedom is an innate biological instinct. This is perfectly true. But this does not make the drive for freedom by itself a primary historical force. Incidentally, Fromm in this work, has failed to advance our understanding of the psychological nature of freedom. He freely concedes that psychology is not "yet able to state clearly in psychological terms what the exact nature of this human dynamism is." But he insists we must nevertheless, recognize its existence. Its existence is not and may not be denied. It is for Fromm, however, to establish how these

psychological drives function as independent, primary forces. This brings us to his psychological analysis of the Reformation and Fascism.

* * * *

The Reformation was basically a psychological phenomenon which arose in response to the specific needs of this particular historical period. Elucidating his conception that side by side with the economic element, psychological drives play a primary role in historical causation, Fromm points out that:

> "Significant changes in the psychological atmosphere accompanied the development of Capitalism. . . . The concept of time in the modern sense began to develop. To many holidays began to appear as a misfortune. . . . Work became increasingly a supreme value. The idea of efficiency assumed the role of one of the highest virtues."[6] (Page 58.)

It was by introducing these new economic categories as moral values of the highest value that Protestantism prepared man for his new role under capitalist society.[7]

The psychological basis for the rise of Protestantism and its religion of the virtue of work and thrift was to be found in the dissolution of the fixed social ties of mediaeval feudal society, which engendered a sense of aloneness and isolation and a general feeling of powerlessness and personal insignificance. According to Fromm:

> "Protestantism was the answer to the human needs of the frightened, isolated individual who had to orient and to relate himself to a new world. The new character structure resulting from economic and social changes and intensified by religious doctrines (which played an independent, primary role, A. Z.) became in turn an important factor in shaping the further social and economic development. Those very qualities which were rooted in this character structure—compulsion to work, passion for thrift . . . were character traits which became productive forces in capitalist society. . . ." (Page 102.)

Fromm poses the question,[8] why was the idea of work and success as the main aims of life able to become so powerful and appealing to modern man and why do these ideas have no appeal for and have failed to develop, for example, among Pueblo Indians or the Mexican peasants? He answers: it was the aloneness and doubt created by the dissolution of the social ties of feudal society which prepared the emotional matrix which led to the

[6] "In every society man has to work if he wants to live. Many societies solved the problem by having work done by slaves, thus allowing the free man to devote himself to 'nobler' occupations. In such societies work was not worthy of a free man. . . . In medieval society, too, the burden of work was unequally distributed among the different classes in the social hierarchy, and there was a good deal of crude exploitation. But the attitude toward work was different from that which developed subsequently in the modern era. . . . What was new in modern society was that men came to be driven to work not so much by external pressure but by an internal compulsion, which made them work as only a very strict master could have made people work in any other society. . . . There is no other period in which free men have given their energy so completely for the one purpose, work" (pages 93, 94).

[7] ("By the doctrines of Protestantism man was psychologically prepared for the role he was to play under the modern industrial system" (page 103).

[8] Pages 279-280.

acceptance of these ideas in the psychological escape form of the Protestant religion.

Here we have the nub of Fromm's psychological conception of history. In this form stripped of all non-essential trimmings it is a simple task to lay bare its inherent fallaciousness. If the attitude towards work as an aim in itself and the passion for worldly success are psychological attributes growing out of a sense of aloneness and doubt brought on by the insecurity created by the dissolution of previously existing social ties, then the question arises, why were not these so-called psychological beliefs developed at the time when the fixed gentile kinship relationships of primitive society were being dissolved? History informs us that the dissolution of gentile society and its transformation into political, civil society was accompanied by plenty of confusion, social disorder and "aloneness and doubt." But instead of the cult of work as an aim in itself and worldly success arising at that time, chattel slavery society which followed, spurned work as unworthy of freeman. Or let us take the historical example of the dissolution of the social order of ancient society—chattel slavery. Here too the dissolution of existing, fixed social ties created confusion, "aloneness and doubt." But in place of the cult of work as an aim in itself and worldly success, the social order of feudalism which is the very negation of these values, arose on the ruins of chattel slavery. Why did the psychological conditions of "aloneness and doubt" existing at the time of the dissolution of primitive society, and of chattel slavery, fail to create a psychological passion for work, while on the other hand the "aloneness and doubt" created by the dissolution of the social ties of mediaeval, feudal society (to employ Fromm's terminology) did succeed in creating a new attitude toward effort and work. The answer to this question is quite obvious. Feudalism, and Chattel Slavery before it, had no *economic* need for the passion of work as an aim in itself, the passion of thrift and the value of efficiency. These economic traits, however, were indispensable for the nascent order of Capitalism and without them it could not hope to develop and function. It was because these "drives" reflected the ideological and technical needs of historically developed conditions of capitalist production that they made their appearance when they did.

Fromm tells us that the "new attitude toward work as an aim in itself" that accompanied capitalist production was no less important for the development of our industrial system than steam and electricity. Quite true. However, the basic importance of steam and electricity, and of science and technology in general, for capitalist production does not warrant the technician in postulating a technological conception of history with technical factors playing a primary role upon an equal plane with economic forces. The fact of the matter is that modern technocracy is a product of the needs of capitalist production.

We now return to a consideration of the social significance of the Reformation and the Protestant religion. Protestantism was but the ideological reflection of the political, moral, economic and judicial needs of the rising

(Continued on page 35)

THE PARTY "AGAINST" THE CLASS

By F. A. Ridley

[*We continue our discussion on the Role of the Party* with a contribution by the distinguished British Marxist publicist F. A. Ridley, who is already well known to American Socialists as a trenchant and incisive writer, by his contributions to the former "Modern Monthly" and "International Review." We welcome Ridley to our columns and present his particular viewpoint, which differs basically from our own, in the interests of revolutionary re-education.—The Editor.*]

Modern Socialism is to be congratulated on its initiative both in instituting the present symposium on "The Role of the Party" and, equally, upon the high level of the theoretical discussion. If, in general, my own position approximates to that of Maitland, my party comrade, this, in no way, derogates from the high level upon which Anton Pannekoek and Paul Mattick present their case; as is, indeed, only to be expected from the whole tenor of their previous writings. In the present universal débacle of the international socialist movement it must be left to individuals to find, by a process of trial and error, the way to rehabilitate a decayed and temporarily frustrated movement by opening up fresh avenues of thought in order to meet the ever-changing exigencies of an ever-changing world. We recall the admirable dictum of Lucien Laurat, that Karl Marx, were he with us again today, would bid us, not so much to study his writings, as to study the present situation in the light of his writings! Such, Comrades Pannekoek, Mattick and Maitland, have faithfully endeavored to do, each according to the measure of light afforded him. Such, also, the present writer seeks to do. Far from us be the dead hand of a putrefying orthodoxy, be it "Stalinist," Social Democrat, or even a bastard "Marxism," seeking to stabilize finality in defiance of the very nature of dialectic, of contradiction! Far from us be that kind of spurious orthodoxy, or sterile scholasticism, that mistakes words for things: "where there are no problems to be solved, but only authorities to be consulted." In a tentative discussion of this kind it behooves us to remember the dictum of that old Liberal politician (Augustine Birrel), who once stated that he represented no one but himself; adding that he enjoyed the full confidence of his constituents!

Assuming as we do the two basic tenets of Marxism—that is, "Living Marxism" and not the "Marxist" scholasticism of the epigones—viz., the class-struggle and the primacy of the economic as the twin dictators of the history of (class) society, the question of the mutual relations of the class and the party ultimately boil down to this: can the class automatically move into (revolutionary) action without the political leadership and educational direction of the party, of its vanguard? We repeat: this is the whole question; a question of political and social *possibility*, not of ethical preferences. The

*See the Role of the Party—A Discussion—"Modern Socialism," Winter, 1941-42.

latter, so often substituted for the real discussion, for the real issue at stake, are merely tautological in character. No one outside an asylum can really doubt that it would be, abstractly speaking, vastly "better" in every way for the class, for the broad mass, to emancipate itself, *if this were at all possible.* Who, for instance can come to any other than one conclusion when confronted with the similar choice between, say, dictatorship or democracy, peace or war, constitutionalism (the ballot-box), or violent revolution? Considered solely as moral abstractions, as social alternatives; considered purely theoretically, no one could hesitate between them. And yet our age, with a wider popular knowledge than ever before generally available, obstinately resorts to revolution in preference to democracy, to war rather than to peace. Is this pure "cussedness" on the part of even the most advanced sections of mankind, or does it not rather indicate, and by deeds that are a thousand times more eloquent than words, that a humanity still enmeshed in the toils of class-society, cannot yet do without these things; and that the advocates of the more advanced ethical concepts are ahead of their age and, as such, are too far in advance of it to exercise any practical influence upon it? Hence, and as a direct result, they have to content themselves with a theoretical triumph only; in pursuance of that truth expressed by Lenin, that, "Justice can never be in advance of the economic conditions." It is, indeed, the function; we might almost say, the historic duty, of ethics to be in advance of their contemporary society. That is what they are there for! None the less, we must never let ourselves forget that ethics deal with what is *desirable*, whilst politics are concerned solely with what is *possible;* possible, that is, at the time, not at any future time.

Therefore, summarizing what has been written above, we have to ask ourselves, not whether it is desirable morally and socially for the class to emancipate itself without any dependence on the party, but, rather, whether such an emancipation is even historically possible in view of the prevailing social conditions which willy-nilly, form the startng point of the Act of Emancipation. Any other approach is, we submit, a mere "wishful-thinking," a congeries of delusions. "In the beginning was (and is) the Act."

It is, we suggest, because Messrs. Pannekoek and Mattick, not to mention the late Martov and the present S.P.G.B. (Socialist Party of Great Britain[1]) in this country, start by assuming that the working-class is what they would like it to be, and not what it is in actuality, that their essential thought becomes Utopian and remote from reality as it exists in our contemporary world. Let us screw up our courage and face the unwelcome reality. The contemporary working masses both peasant and proletarian, are the product, not of Marxist theory, either "living" or dead, but rather, of a brutal and brutalizing class-society, of Capitalist-Imperialism, of Capitalism that, in full decay, everywhere either openly Fascist, or, at least, verging upon similar forms of totalitarianism, militarism, and obscurantism: a proletariat, moreover, that is now caught in the full spate of mass-unemployment in "peace-time"—or, rather, armistice—and by "total" war, with all its horrors, in war-time at ever-

[1] Workers Socialist Party in this country (EDITOR'S NOTE).

diminishing intervals. Insecurity is, indeed, the watchword of the proletariat, henceforth, in both war and peace: insecurity of life in war-time, and of labor and livelihood in peace-time. Under such conditions, we ask, where and when is it reasonable to expect an "educated"—that is, socially educated—proletariat to arise: do the barrack-square and the Labor Exchange—more and more, the "spiritual homes" of the masses under Imperialism—in—decay—automatically, or even at all probably, turn out men and women with the moral courage, mental gifts, and critical reasoning powers of a Pannekoek and a Mattick, of a Kautsky and a Rosa Luxemburg? As the decay of Capitalism accentuates, as it is now doing at head-long speed, as the "Thirty Years War" of declining Imperialism staggers from horror to horror, as contemporary "Society" strengthens its "total" and inquisitorial trends, and proceeds, retrogressively, from the lunatic asylum to its padded cell, as, we see not the advance of the proletariat, but the alternate armies of the unemployed and cannon-fodder continue to succeed each other in an ever-dizzier rotation, so, concurrently, does that typical dream of the stable nineteenth century fade away; of progress "gradually broadening down," of a peaceful uninterrupted evolution of society, of an ever-ascending mountain with no eventual *descents;* of, as a necessary corollary, the peacefully evolving proletariat moving forward with an inevitable "gradualness" towards the unopposed mastery of society: the entire vision is alluring; it is not disgraceful Utopianism, for Marx and Engels themselves dreamt it; but it is, none the less, Utopian, and the Utopianism of a bygone age, at that: the age of an ascending *bourgeois* society, of self-confident "Victorianism"; the golden age of bourgeois Democracy.

We now know that this age had its own delusions, despite its self-assertive rationalism. To be sure, all similar ages of stability have theirs; whether it be the Roman Age of the Antonines, that apogee of the classical culture, which then experienced its short-lived Indian summer (Second Century A.D.), or conversely, the sixteenth century Renaissance, the ardent youth of the new (capitalist) social order conscious of its great superiority over its decrepit feudal predecessor and of the vast potentialities that surged within its creative urge. In all such cases of a rising social culture the vision includes Utopian and unrealizable elements. The dreams of the (proximate) "inevitability" of Socialism and the almost "behaviorist" reflect of the workers in their movement of automatic response, being, essentially to the tradition of Utopianism, and of *bourgeois* Utopianism. It is surely obvious, today in 1942, that the future evolution—"excelsior"—ever upward! of bourgeois society is a proven myth if ever there was one. Is Oswald Spengler an advance on Herbert Spencer, or Hitler on Darwin, even from the bourgeois cultural standpoint? Similarly, where is the super-Marxist continuation of Marx? The British Labor Party? Political poltroonery personified! Or Stalin's super-Fascist "purges?" The nineteenth century idea of uninterrupted progress is a dream, even if Marx and Engels dreamt it. (Personal Infallibility is, in any case, a dialectical contradiction in terms.) *And the whole idea of the proletariat peacefully growing in intelligence and finally "growing" automatically into Socialism is part of the dream.* It "belongs" wholly and en-

tirely, to the vision of a rising bourgeois culture: it is a grotesque nightmare in the era of that selfsame culture's bloody collapse into the putrescent swamp of Fascism and Militarism. It is true, more now than ever before, that Capitalism does "educate" its workers, but the propaganda of Goebbels and Vansittart is scarely education in the sense that, say, Pannekoek and Mattick are educated! Long ago, both Bismarck and the English Liberals realized that, "we must educate our masters," and they have! Fascism most of all! If there is any automatic future for the workers under the "total" State it is as the race-intoxicated robots of the victorious "Herren-Volk," in the case of the victors, and as colonial slaves who are also robots, in the defeated countries. The idea that present-day bourgeois society, either openly Fascist, or on the verge of the "total" State, could or would give its workers any other kind of political, economic, and/or social education, is simply sheer delusion.

Accordingly, we necessarily conclude from what we have already argued above, that the idea of a democratic, spontaneous, or virtually so, advance of the masses into socialism, national and international, as a result of its evolving conditions, is a pure myth; explicable, indeed, but only as a reflex of *historical* conditions, of the conditions, that is, of the then still rising bourgeois era, and not of the actual conditions of today. Left to its own devices the mass will never rise; any more than the scientific and cultural advancement of the human race has been due to a mass plebiscite. Where the material and ideological conditions are such as to breed ignorance, servility, and fear, as in all class-society, the mass may, indeed, riot, or even under intolerable conditions, revolt, but a self-conscious *planned revolution* will always be beyond its capacity. The profound aphorism of old Campanella: "the people is a beast of muddy brain"; must, everywhere and always, be the case with the masses in a class-divided society based upon ruthless and never-ceasing exploitation. A Pannekoek, a Mattick, a Maitland, can and do emerge from the subterranean mass, as a Spartacus and a Münzer have emerged at a yet lower level of social evolution. But a slave class composed entirely or even to any substantial degree, of Matticks and Pannekoeks, never has, and never will exist so long as a class rule endures, and slavery continues to be slavery. To reason otherwise is to disclose a latent "idealism" (in the philosophical sense), however ostensibly materialist the line of argument. Like breeds like: slavery, the slave!

The conception then, of the Party; of the "brain"—as Maitland styles it—yes, and the eyes, the lungs, and the strong right hand also of the class discloses itself, not, we repeat, as something in itself desirable, but rather, as the *inevitable* vehicle of revolutionary upheaval and change in the era of revolution and counter-revolution that is now dawning.

To outline, with the necessary detail to do it justice, the role of the revolutionary party is here impossible for reasons of space: it would require, indeed, not a volume even, but a library, and from its very nature far transcents the modest limits of an article. At some future time and place we may return to this central revolutionary problem of our times, here, we must perforce conclude with these three brief propositions.

(a) The party which comes to power does so not as the result of abstract

reasoning, but of the concrete class struggle. In overcoming its precedent counter-revolution it adapts to its own use whatsoever the existing order and its counter-revolution may have to teach it. For the revolution follows counter-revolution, as the latter, in its day, followed upon, and learned from, earlier phases of revolution. For example, Fascism has learned from, and improved upon, Bolshevism, and the coming party of Social Revolution must begin where Fascist technical evolution leaves off. In the consecutive history of revolution and counter-revolution Fascism was the imitator, "dialectical negative," and conqueror of (international) Bolshevism. The coming Social Revolution will fulfill all three roles in relation to Fascism. To fight Fascism —as the Trotskyites for example do—by a return to Bolshevism, is reactionary —in the literal sense—and doomed thereby to failure. Just as it is the generic failing of the military profession to fight the last war all over again, so it is the habit of revolutionaries to fight the last revolution. To paraphrase Clemenceau, revolution is too serious a matter to be left to (professional) revolutionaries! (Clemenceau said this of war.) Hence the revolutionary party at which we must aim is not, and cannot conceivably be, merely an echo of what has gone before.

(b) Fascism has added to the conception of counter-revolution the concept of the "total" State, including in particular, an "ersatz" ethic, also of a total kind. As in life, the real defeats the sham *(i.e.*, ersatz), so only a "total" ethic of a revolutionary nature can defeat Fascism. For in our era the revolutionary is the real—and vice versa. The Socialist movements in the immediate past, in their justifiable reaction against Utopianism (in the early Socialist sense) have "emptied out the baby with the bath water," and have concentrated exclusively upon politics and economics, and have let culture and ethic go by the board! Stalinism has even made a cult of amoralism á la Macchiavelli. But man is, as a social being, necessarily and primarily an ethical animal, whilst, as a revolutionary he is, first and foremost, an *heroic* animal. Revolutions are *caused* on the material plane, but they are *made* on the moral plane; the plane of altruism, of heroism. A revolutionary does not demand a trade-union wage for defying the Gestapo: one does not die on the "barricades" for a post-mortem rise in wages! The revolution does not exist to promote spiritualism! Sorel understood this aspect of social revolution much better, we will not say than Marx, but certainly than the Marxists. It is a major tragedy of the era of counter-revolution, constituting it as such, that Fascism has understood and exalted its "ersatz" ethics very much more than Socialism has its genuine variety. Here in particular, the coming International of Revolutionary Parties will begin where Fascism, the Counter-Revolution, leaves off. It will give humanity a genuine ethic to replace the outmoded supernaturalism of religion; a genuine revolutionary scientific culture to replace the atavistic racial ethics of the counter-revolution. In so doing it will prevail: for in *social* currency "Bad money does *not* drive out good." Ultimately, the reverse comes about: the higher system, economic and ethical, will eventually win.

(c) The revolutionary party must, of necessity, be a dictatorial party. It is willy-nilly, conditioned by the material upon which it works. (In the

(Continued on page 27)

"CAPITALIST" PROPERTY IN GERMANY

By Abraham Ziegler

Since the advent of the Nazi régime in Germany there has appeared a veritable flood of literature on the subject of National Socialism, its theory and practice, and social implications. For the most part, however, this abundant material has been of questionable and doubtful value, contributing but little to an understanding of the enigma of National Socialism. There has just appeared a work* that stands head and shoulders above the general run of literature on this subject. Although we catagorically reject its political conclusions, it must be stated that *Behemoth* is the most scholarly and comprehensive book yet to appear in this field. It is not only an important work, but it is (particularly in its section on National Socialist Law and Terror) a definite contribution to an understanding and mastery of the subject.

* * * *

Neumann characterizes the Nazi economy in the following language:

> "The German economy of today has two broad and striking characteristics. It is a monopolist economy and a command economy. It is a private capitalist economy regimented by the totalitarian state. We suggest as a name best to describe it, Totalitarian Monopoly Capitalism." (Page 261.)

Neumann leaves no doubt that in his opinion Capitalism continues to function on in Germany, but in new forms. In substantiation of this thesis Neumann points to the Nazi cartel policy which has deliberately favored and enormously extended the influence of Big Business and Monopoly as a productive force. Unlike America, German monopoly and cartels at all times enjoyed a legal existence. However, down to the advent of the Nazis a small sector of industry continued to operate upon an independent basis in opposition to the cartels. Shortly after assuming office the Nazis introduced a measure providing for compulsory and universal cartelization. By the statute of July 15, 1933, the Minister of Economy was empowered to creat compulsory cartels; to force independents to join existing cartels to prohibit the erection of new enterprises and the extension of existing enterprises, either in seize or capacity and to regulate the capacity of existing plants. This law was vigorously enforced and today German economy has become fully monopolized and cartelized. According to Neumann not only has top-capitalism and monopoly crushed the independents and established their own unchallenged supremacy, but under the Nazi régime, the sacred trinity of Capitalist production, entrepreneural initiative, competition and the profit motive continue to regulate the mechanism of the economy.

---

* *Behemoth*—The Structure and Practice of National Socialism, by Franz Neumann. Oxford University Press, New York. ($4.00.)

"Entrepreneural initiative is not dead, it is as vital as ever before, perhaps even more so." (Page 292.)

"Cartelization and monopolization are not the negation of competition, but only another form of it . . . far from negating competition, cartels assert it. The struggle for production or sales quotas within the cartel—for raw materials, for capital, for consumers—determines the character, the stability and durability of the cartel." (Pages 291-292.)

"It is the aggressive, imperialist, expansionist spirit of big business . . . which is the motivating force of the economic system. Profits and more profits are the motive power." (Page 354.)

Finally, notwithstanding price control and regulation, he insists that:

"Prices still play the decisive part in determining who shall produce, or better, who shall produce most. The expansion of a plan improves its competitive position and thereby increases its profits, in turn expanding production. To restrict production is, under conditions of full employment, unnecessary. But it is precisely the incessant excess of demand over supply that provides a powerful stimulus for expansion and higher profits." (Page 314.)

To begin with, there is no question but that Neumann makes out a convincing case for the proposition that Nazi control has not only not interfered with the dominant industrial position of the Monopoly interests, but has permitted them to establish an impregnable position of supremacy. But his conclusion that the Nazis in strengthening the position of Monopoly in the economy are motivated by feelings or considerations of subservience to Big Business, by no means follows. The Nazis support of the Monopoly interests against their smaller competitors was motivated by technical-administrative considerations and not by political subservience. In the first place, concentration and centralization is an inevitable concomitant of modern production. Then, as our author himself points out, the organization of industry into cartels "is a better and higher form or organization." Moreover, preparations for totalitarian warfare and its successful conduct made imperative the elimination of the smaller, inefficient, uneconomic units.

In describing the automatism of the Nazi economy in the classical Capitalist terms of entrepreneural initiative, competition and the profit motive, Neumann commits the cardinal error (common to all protagonists of the continuing Capitalist nature of the Nazi economy) of confusing and misusing precise, technical, economic terms. In the field of political economy it has heretofore been generally understood that the concept entrepreneural initiative embodied the right to make the "decisive economic decisions concerning the quantity, character and proportions of the physical goods produced." As was stated in *In Re. Germany*† in the course of a very favorable review of *Behemoth*, these decisions "have been taken out of the entrepreneur's hands and are planned and executed by the state. Even the private interests of the mightiest monopoly can not bring about major changes in these dispositions." In contending that competition still continues to survive in Ger-

† April, 1942. Published by The American Friends of German Freedom.

many under Nazi rule, Neumann confuses the secondary, internal competition within the cartels, *i.e.*, the struggle to obtain a greater proportion of the government war orders which is waged by the respective members of the cartels, with competition as a basic economic force regulating the processes of production, two separate and distinct propositions. Under Capitalist production the entire process of production is regulated by the price of products and capital tends to flow from those fields where the return is low to those spheres which provide a greater return on the invested capital. This entire process is carried out privately by means of the famous entrepreneural initiative, unshackled by state interference. This is the competition that economists speak of. Competition in Germany, the regulation of production by the oscillation of prices, the free movement of capital from one sphere of production to another, has been abolished. As has been pointed out, the kind and amount of production to be carried on is determined by the state. Private enterprise has no voice in this matter. True, there is a brisk internal competition to determine "who shall produce most," but this secondary competition in no manner affects or regulates the process of production, and in the first place, only commences after the course and extent of production has been determined. "Who produces most" is primarily a technical-administrative problem. The Nazi overlords need increased production at any price, and since Monopoly is in a much better position to produce, it has been favored in the distribution of orders. The fact that the private Monopoly interests are coining fabulous war profits merely signifies that such is the vital need of the régime for increased war production, that it is prepared to pay handsomely for the cooperation of the Industrialists. In Russia, Stalin also richly rewards the more efficient managers and technicians—so much so that they have become a privileged strata of the population—but this does not constitute the Soviet economy a Capitalist economy. Both in Russia and Germany bigger "profits" or increased financial returns to the managers and directors are merely incentives provided for increased production. In both countries prices are arbitrarily regulated, with the control over the disposition of the means of production in the hands of the state. Since the character and quantity of production is determined by the state and governed by considerations of power policies and not primarily for profit, since the free movement of capital is fettered and restricted, a free market-price economy no longer exists and the law of competition no longer operates as the regulator of production.

We come now to a consideration of the "profit motive," which it is insisted, is the motive power of the Nazi economy. Once more we must point out that the term profit motive in political economy has a precise, technical meaning. The profit motive is not synonymous with the lust for gain. Gain has been the motive power of all systems of production based upon private property. The profit motive implies production privately determined and controlled and carried on primarily for profit. These conditions do not exist in Germany. One has only to ask how much freedom has the individual Monopolist to contravene the production decisions of the state, to conclusively settle the question as to who controls production in Germany. The fact that Hitler has not scrupled to liquidate a number of leading Industrialists on the

grounds of "sabotaging" production, vividly illustrates the secondary role that the Industrialists play in Nazi Germany.

Neumann confuses the profit motive as the dominant and controlling factor of production with profits (*i.e.*, revenue or financial gain) as an incentive to or as the motive power of production. It is quite true that National Socialism employs higher "profits" as the motive power, the gasoline with which to fuel its economic mechanism. But to say that gasoline is the motive power that propels an automobile, by no means indicates who controls the automobile and to what use it is being put. By analogy Neumann would have us believe that inasmuch "profits" (gasoline) supply the motive power for the Nazi economic machine, *ergo* the profit motive operates within Nazi Germany and its economy is a capitalist controlled one. The fact that Hitler finds it more expedient to operate the means of production under the fiction of private ownership and uses financial rewards to stimulate a maximum of production, does not convert such financial rewards into profits (the product accruing to independent entrepreneurs under a private capitalist economy). The Nazi economy is a Bureaucratic-Collectivist order controlled by the state and motivated by political considerations of winning world power and ascendancy.

* * * *

To the Marxist student one of the most interesting sections of *Behemoth* deals with the status of labor within Nazi Germany. Unlike the sectarian Marxists, who far the most part ignore or minimize the elementary truism that "free labor distinguishes capitalism from any other previous economic system," Neumann pronounces this view as "certainly correct." At the same time he comes to the remarkable conclusion that free labor and the labor contract still exist in Germany in the traditional sense.

> "Since freedom of labor and contract means primarily a distinction between labor and leisure time with the laborers selling their time only for specific performances, which are defined by agreement statute and custom, and they are not obliged to do any kind of work their employer might arbitrarily determine. . . . The labor contract is still the form that rules labor relations."

This is a most ingenious distinction, but one wholly devoid of merit. It is quite true, as argued, that the distinction between labor and leisure is as sharp in Germany as it is in any democracy. However, the distinction between labor time and leisure time is not a socio-economic one which determines the social status of labor, but purely a physiological one. Modern high speed production demands a separation between labor and leisure time. It is well known that attempts to extend the working day unduly results in a lowered productivity and defeat themselves. The Nazi attempt to introduce an unlimited work day by means of terror failed precisely because of this physiological limitation. Formally, the labor contract, like so many other forms of capitalist production, remains in Germany, but it has been reduced to a mere empty shell. All elements of voluntary consent upon the part of labor have been abolished. The German worker does not sell his labor power. He is

coerced to labor under terms established by the Labor Trustee, terms which he or his representatives have no part at all in framing. As Neumann himself points out, the German worker is subject to "combing out" from non-essential war industries into war industries: a most thoroughgoing labor draft. It is quite true that the worker is not obliged to do any kind of work his employer may arbitrarily determine, but this is only due to the fact that it is the Nazi Labor Trustee, not the employer, who wields this power. To contend that the German worker whose labor power is subject to the absolute control of the state, enters into a labor contract, is to make a mockery out of the contract status. A contract above all is a free and voluntary agreement between two parties, it can not be a one-sided affair. It may as logically be contended, that because the Reichstag still continues to formally exist and actually meets from time to time, *ergo* Parliamentarianism still functions in Germany.

Since free labor no longer exists, by the very criterion that Neumann himself accepts, the Nazi economy must be held to be definitely non-capitalist.

Before leaving the economic section of *Behemoth* it is necessary to point out a certain weakness and flaw in the author's presentation, *i.e.*, his penchant for accepting the propagandist, demagogic self-serving pronouncements of the Nazi leaders at face value and offering them as serious proof in support of his conclusions. This is the more surprising in that he himself at the very outset of his book called attention to the fact that the statements of the National Socialist leaders were wholly worthless in getting at the truth.‡ For example, Neumann quotes approvingly the following gem culled from a speech by Major-General George Thomas, head of the division of the defense economy in the High Army Command:

> "Extensive restriction of free market production does not mean obstructing the entreprenural initiative; on the contrary, the more active, resourceful and daring the head of an enterprise, the more will he be able to fulfill his war task."

We have already pointed out the non-existence of entrepreneural initiative in Nazi Germany. General Thomas knows this only too well. However, the Nazis are interested in maintaining the voluntary cooperation of the Industrialists so they still continue to talk of "entrepreneural initiative," buttered up with fat promises of unlimited expansion after the war when private industry will move once more in full freedom. Specifically, Thomas' appeal for recklessness and daring was provoked by the reluctance of the Industrialists to reinvest their war profits in *ersatz* plants for which there will be no need after the war. And Neumann acquiesces in this Nazi double-talk, accepting it as solid coin! He turns out to be a poor pupil for his own teaching.

* * * *

In his masterly section on "National Socialist Law and Terror," Neumann, by contrasting the bourgeois legal philosophy and relations with the contrary

‡ "In getting at the truth of National Socialist ideology, we must rely on sociological methods. There is no other way of getting at the truth, least of all from the explicit statements of the National Socialist leaders." (Page 37.)

Bureaucratic-Collectivist relations in Nazi Germany, presents a devastating refutation of his thesis that the Nazi economy continues capitalist in character.

In their celebrated theory of the Materialistic Conception of History, Marx and Engels pointed out that the legal institutions and conceptions of a given society "in essence sanctions only the existing economic relations between individuals" which prevail in that society with "bourgeois legal relations merely expressing the economic life conditions of bourgeois society in legal form." Neumann brilliantly demonstrates how its legal relations and conceptions reflect the needs of bourgeois production. Pointing out that bourgeois law establishes the norm of general law and the absolute subordination of the judge to the law, he asks the question:

> "What is the social significance of the theory of the rule of the law, of the denial of natural law, and the absolute subordination of the judge to the law."

He proceeds to give the following answer:

> "The rule of the law is necessary to satisfy the needs of a competitive society which seeks to create profit through continuous rational capitalist undertaking. Free competition requires general law (as opposed to arbitrary individual decisions, A. Z.), because that represents the highest degree of formal rationality. Free competition rests upon the existence of a large number of more or less equal competitors who meet on a free market. Freedom of the commodity market, freedom of the labor market, freedom of contract and above all, calculability of the administration of justice, are the essential requirements. . . . Finally, the judge himself must be independent, that is, the various powers in the state must be completely separate.
>
> "The generality and abstractness of law, together with the independence of the judge guarantee a minimum of personal and political liberty. . . . The general law establishes personal equality. The fundamental concepts of the positivist (bourgeois) system are the legal person, both natural and juristic, the subjective private right expressing the freedom of the person that exists before the objective law (its highest expression is the law of property); and the contract to which all human relations must be reducible: state and association, marriage and sale, church and trade union. The state is a legal person, sovereignty does not rest in social groups, but in the state-person itself operating through its organs. The individual has subjective public rights against the state." (Pages 442, 443, 444, 448.)

Under the rule of these legal conceptions and the protection that they afforded, the régime of private capitalist-commodity production flourished mightily. It grew so enormously that it underwent a qualitative change from private, individual property into monopoly property. Now while Monopoly is in its essence private and continues to operate upon the basis of private initiative, it already carries within its folds the germ of social, collectivized property. The triumph of Nazism is followed by the abolition of Monopoly

as independent private property and its metamorphosis into Bureaucratic-Collectivist property.

Neumann fails to note this changed social character of Monopoly under National Socialism. He continues to present Monopoly in the light of an independent social force under Nazism. Monopoly, unlike competitive capitalism, has no need for freedom of contract and equality before the law. In fact freedom of contract and the principle of equality are fetters upon the full development of Monopoly—fetters which must be removed. Neumann points out that the transition period between the disintegration of competitive capitalism and the emergence of the ascendency of Monopoly in Germany was marked by a breakdown of the principles of bourgeois law.

> "The period of 1918 to 1932 was characterized by the almost universal acceptance of the doctrine of free discretion (Freirechsschule), by the breakdown of rationality and calculability of the law, by the limitation of the system of contract (replaced in part by the idea of command), by the victory of legal standards of conduct over true legal norms. . . . They (the legal standards of conduct, A. Z.) gave the judge amazingly broad discretionary powers and they destroyed the line between the judiciary and the administration so that administrative political decisions took on the form of normal court decisions." (Page 446.)

The triumph of Hitler marked the completion of this period of legal transition. The bourgeois legal concepts of the freedom of contract, the subjective rights of property, equality before the law and subjective public rights against the state were replaced by new legal norms reflecting the new economic relations introduced in the form of Bureaucratic-Collectivized property.

> "National Socialism completely destroys the generality of the law and with it the independence of the judiciary and the prohibitions against retroactivity. . . . The judge has been reduced to the status of a police official. . . . All the political power of the German race is united in the Leader, it rests in his hands. All law, therefore, derives from him. . . . Law is now a technical means for the achievement of specific political aims." (Pages 447, 448.)

The fundamental different character of National Socialist law as compared to bourgeois law is illustrated by their diametrically different concepts of the nature of property.

> "In short (under the régime of National Socialism, A. Z.) property changes from a subjective right belonging to a legal person into an institution, a reified social relation. The contract is not only excluded in practice, it even loses its role in the legal ideology." (Page 449.)

From which but one logical deduction may be drawn: capitalist private property no longer exists in Germany. But Neumann categorically rejects this conclusion. He affirms that private property, notwithstanding, continues to exist on in Germany. We are told that the Nazi civil courts are "primarily

the agents for the execution of the commands of monopolistic business organizations." This amazing *ober dicta* conclusion which is at fisticuffs with the whole course and tenor of Neumann's masterly analysis of the social background of bourgeois and National Socialist law can only be explained upon the basis of a pre-conceived predeliction.

A story is told by Marx, of the crazy Englishman in Bedlam, who imagines he is living in the days of the Pharaohs, and daily laments the hard work that he must do in the Ethiopian mines as a gold digger, immured in a subterranean prison, with a dim lamp fastened on his head, behind him the slave overseers with a long whip, and at the mouths of the mine a mob of barbarous camp servants who understand neither the convicts in the mines or one another, because they do not speak a common language. "And all this," cries the crazy Englishman, "is demanded of me, the free-born Englishman, to make gold for old Pharaoh." The Englishman, so long as he was in his senses, could not rid himself of the rooted thought of making gold. It would appear that Neumann cannot rid himself of the rooted thought that the Nazi economy continues to be a private capitalistic economy, notwithstanding his own devastating refutation of that thesis.

Where the right to "private property" is not recognized in the jurisprudence of the land, such property can only be maintained and protected by possession of the superior powers of the state§ and Neumann does not contend that Monopoly controls the Nazi state, let alone prove it. The expropriation of Thyssen, under a law forbidding communistic activities, the liquidation of a number of prominent Industrialists (as a warning to their fellow Industrialists) for alleged sabotage only serves to emphasize that capitalist rights no longer exist in Nazi Germany, and that private property has become subordinated to political power considerations. The Industrialists continue to hold their "private" property only by sufferance. To be sure there are numerous pronouncements by Nazi leaders affirming that the right of private property continues to be recognized under National Socialism. But at this late date is it really necessary to point out the worthlessness and the utter demagogy of these declarations, the more especially when they are so completely refuted by the actual reality? Suffice to state that these affirmations have as much value as General Thomas' fairy tale about "entrepreneural initiative" continuing on in Germany.

* * * *

There are a number of other matters dealt with in *Behemoth* which space limitations prevent us from noticing, but which are well worth the serious student's attention. All in all, notwithstanding the limitations and shortcomings we have pointed out, *Behemoth* remains by far the outstanding work on the theory and practice of National Socialism.

§ *Cf.* the private property of Hitler and the other Nazi Leaders.

British Trade Unionism: A Revolutionary Perspective

By Walter Padley

[*Notwithstanding the war and the urgency of the problems it has posed for the working class movement, Socialist Industrial Unionism continues to be the most important issue before the workers today. Because in the past, MODERN SOCIALISM has neglected to give this question the attention it warrants, we are happy to reprint from the February issue of "Left" a British Socialist Monthly publication of controversy, the following article from the pen of the well-known West-Indian Marxist Walter Padley. Padley, carrying out in practice the theory he preaches, is an active participant in the British Trade Union movement in addition to his political activities as a member of the National Committee of the Independent Labor Party.*

In bringing the question of Socialist Industrial Unionism, "taking and holding the industries" to the fore and posing the question of workers' power in terms of industrial class conscious organization accompanied by class conscious political action, Padley performs a distinctly valuable service at this crucial period in working class history. His article while dealing with the British Trade Union scene nevertheless, is of equal importance and interest for American workers, since the same conditions are present here in American Trades Unionism.—The Editor.]

That class conflict is the elemental dynamic in social change is a basic proposition of Socialism—Socialism as Marx, Lenin and Luxemburg understood it. In the modern world, industry is the sharpest point of class antagonism, and industrial activity with a revolutionary perspective takes on a role of decisive importance in the fight for Socialism. For, vital though they are, propaganda and education are truly effective only when undertaken by a Socialist Party as a complement to positive leadership in all phases of the day-to-day struggle of the common people. The task of Revolutionary Socialists is to interpret the experiences of the workers in the light of Marxist theory, thus uniting spontaneous militancy and political consciousness and creating that iron will to power through struggle which is an indispensable condition of social revolution.

If the industrial movement is to occupy a position of such importance in Socialist strategy, it is necessary to question whether the movement is at present organized in a way which facilitates successful *Socialist* action. A realistic evaluation of the British trade unions reveals many weaknesses: craft

prejudices often conflict with class solidarity, rival unions cater for the same type of worker, there is a general lack of coordinated effort, and industrial pacifism has given rise to political inertia.

It has been fashionable in Socialist circles to depict innately leaders as culpable scoundrels, mainly responsible for all trade union failures. But this superficial explanation is a travesty of Marxian method; and there is a certain futility in blaming people for not doing things they have never professed any intention of doing. The British trade unions are no more and no less than what their history has made them. They arose sporadically in response to economic needs felt by workers at various places and times, and the movement did not follow a pre-determined plan as it did in Germany and other countries, where it owed its rise to definite Social-Democratic teaching. Moreover, craft unions were the first stable form of trade union organization to emerge in this country. A drastic structural reorganization was obviously difficult, and so far has not been tackled, though federation and amalgamation have, on the whole, done something to remedy the worst defects. Hence the present, rather bewildering structure and irritating sectionalism.

Closely linked with the organizational question is the problem of function. There are two rival views. The first, which arose with the craft unions and since the defeat of the general strike has been the property of the entire official movement, argues that the task of a trade union is simply to obtain the best possible wage and working conditions by making long-term agreements with employers, by restricting entry into the trade, etc.—the aim is not to overthrow capitalism, but to make it work better from the standpoint of a particular group of workers. The second, endorsed by Revolutionary Socialists, is that a trade union is a weapon in a war inherent in class society, and that any agreements entered into with employers are but armistices in the fight to destroy capitalism.

Not only within the unions, but also inside the heads of individual trade unionists, there is incessant conflict between these rival views; tendencies towards class struggle and class harmony co-exist. Socialists would do well frankly to recognize that employers are sometimes willing to concede better terms at the price of long-term agreements which renounce sympathetic action, and that it often pays them to bribe key men at the expense of other workers. In the long run, of course, industrial pacifism does not pay, because it tends to become a chronic disease (witness the inactivity during the arms boom which preceded the war), and once the employers cease to fear the unions their original bargaining power disappears. Moreover, only the (now dwindling) world power of British Capital has produced the degree of prosperity and stability in this island metropolis to make purely reformist trade unionism appear a fruitful proposition.

Official trade union policy is an attempt to solve the dilemma which results from the conflicting views about the function of the unions. The gradual suppression of capitalism is delegated to the Labor Party which the unions control, while the unions themselves are content with trying to make capitalism yield a little more to their members. Thus has the official movement discounted the industrial arm in the struggle for a new society.

Those who reject Mond-Turnerism for International Socialism must forge an industrial movement capable of shouldering the gigantic task of social revolution—*the* task of this period. As shown above, history has imposed many weaknesses on the British trade unions, but it has also endowed them with an important strength. As a result of its traditions and methods, the movement has a great reserve of "tough" rank-and-file leadership, which invariably breaks through in times of crisis.

Today, while the official movement is bound to capitalism, its State, and its war, and a class truce has been proclaimed for the duration, class action and class leadership still live among the workers in workshop, factory, mill, and mine. Even Government statistics reveal that, though the number of working days lost owing to trade disputes is below the average for the previous decade, the number of disputes is substantially higher. Moreover, since today the overwhelming majority of strikes are unofficial, it is doubtful whether these figures are all-inclusive. On the statistics recorded by the Ministry of Labor, the *Economist* has commented:

> "The large number of disputes combined with their relatively short duration suggests that demands may have been met hastily in order to avoid delay. . . . The great majority only affected single establishments."

Whatever Labor's pious patriots may say, these "guerillas" in defense of living standards and trade union conditions won by generations of struggle augur better for a Socialist future than do the bellicose blarings of Churchill's Labor sycophants. Upon this spirit of independent class action, maintained even during the period of imminent invasion, rests all hope of achieving Labor's age-long objective.

In working to ensure that the war ends, not by an armed truce of decaying capitalisms, but by Socialist victory, Revolutionary Internationalists must seek to remedy the previously mentioned defects of the unions. They must continue to work for industrial unionism—for the view that workers should be organized upon the basis of the commodity produced rather than the tool operated. Capitalist industry tends to evolve mainly in the direction of the vertical form of control—from raw material to final product. Industrial unionism is vertical combination; craft unionism is horizontal combination; the T. and G.W.U. type is neither. Clearly, it is of strategic importance that a group of employers controlling an industry should be faced with a union organization under undivided control. (Nevertheless, there are real problems peculiar to a craft, and in these matters a measure of autonomy must be readily granted.) Historically, industrial unionism has been associated with the idea of "taking and holding" the means of production, and it is self-evident that this form of organization, in contrast to craft and general unionism, is suitable for revolutionary action, for it alone builds a class unity based on the factory.

Neither sectarian propaganda nor conference resolutions can effect the desired changes in the industrial movement of the British workers. Only patient, constructive work among the rank-and-file in the localities can do that.

Already, the shop steward and works committee movement has received

a powerful impetus from the abandonment of struggle by the official leaders. This movement can play a part of tremendous significance. First, it gives organizational expression to the desire to wage "guerillas." Second, since it arises from the genuine needs of the workers and is led by men directly responsible to them, it provides a healthy rank-and-file movement to fight for a militant policy within the unions. And it has the advantage of not conflicting, as did the minority movement and the like, with the elementary loyalty felt by the ordinary worker towards his trade union. Third, it promotes unity at the point of production, breaks down craft and sectional barriers, and can provide the local nuclei upon which a national structure of industrial unions can be built. Fourth, it is the only reliable weapon, in the absence of developed industrial unions, for the overthrow of industrial capitalism, for "taking and holding" the means of production.

It seems likely that in the course of living history, an integrated structure of industrial unions will arise with, and not precede, the social revolution. The immediate task is to encourage the formation of works' committees in every factory and to organize them on a local, district and national basis.

Moreover, it is imperative that the works committee movement be linked with the trades councils. For the latter bodies must be developed into the coordinating centers of all working-class action in the localities, embryo workers' councils in preparation for the capture of State-power in a revolutionary period. At the moment the simplest method of linking up the two movement is for leading stewards to become branch delegates to the councils.

Side by side with formative participation in the day-to-day struggle, Revolutionary Socialists must fight tenaciously for their viewpoint both at the T.U.C. and within its affiliated unions. The debate and vote at the last T.U.C. on the Reorganization Resolution submitted by the National Union of Public Employees shows that a large section of the movement is in a receptive frame of mind. But, even here, the cry of "splitting the unions" was raised by the leaders of the general unions—a foretaste of what may be expected in the campaign for industrial unionism with openly revolutionary aims. Dual unionism is disastrous nonsense, and no act of Socialists should appear to encourage it. Consequently, they must urge the endorsement of all shop stewards by the respective unions, advocate appropriate amalgamations *(e.g.*, of the N.U.R., R.C.A., and A.S.L.E. & F.), and raise the industrial union issue by direct resolution at all important trade union gatherings

No attempt should be made to use a genuine industrial movement for sectarian political ends, because political straitjackets strangle the organic growth of effective industrial organizations. Influence and leadership can be won not by conquering conference and meetings by intrigue, but by selfless devoted service and a constructive policy related to the needs of the ordinary worker.

A Revolutionary Party must strive to win leadership in two senses: (1) of the individual member in his workplace and locality; (2) of the Party, as a Party, and not merely as a collection of individual fighters. In addition to directing the day-to-day struggle and building class confidence through Socialist understanding, it has a duty to popularize the idea of taking control

of the factories, and today the frustration felt by the workers on the production question can be used for these purposes. Let it be remembered that the spontaneity of the Catalan workers in June, 1936, which surprised greybeards all over the world, was no accident; it arose from syndicalist concentration on a single task: "Take and Hold the Factories!" Without falling into the syndicalist heresy of "no politics," Marxists can learn from Spanish experience.

In assuming the leadership of the industrial upsurge, which daily becomes more inevitable with the decline of British Imperial power, Socialists must bring the forward movements to a common political point in order to ensure that the assault on industry and the capture of State-power coincide—the mistake of the Catalan workers must not be repeated! In this country, the I.L.P. alone is capable of becoming that "common political point," the Revolutionary Party. Its increasing concentration on industrial work is a most promising sign. For only success in daily struggle can generate that overwhelming confidence in oneself, one's class, one's organization and one's policy from which bold action and decisive leadership spring.

In conclusion, let it be emphasized that in the present period, when a generalization of monopoly and State control of industry are the dominant economic and political trends, a complete subordination of the trade unions to a State hostile to the interests of the common people is the only alternative to the policy outlined here. Socialist Industrial Unionism or an Imperialist Labor Front, Social Revolution or Fascism—that is how the issues present themselves today.

(*Continued from page* 14)

PARTY "AGAINST" CLASS

event of a precedent universal victory of Fascism, it would inevitably first arise as a secret society with a necessarily iron discipline. "Legal" parties presuppose bourgeois legality.) Formal (political) democracy is, exclusively, a bourgeois concept, as real (social) democracy adheres exclusively to a Communist society. Where classes exist or where even class-struggles survive the conquest of proletarian power and the formal suppression of class-rights, democracy cannot exist: real democracy, that is, whilst formal democracy vanishes with its "onlie begetters," the bourgeoisie. We are, of course, well aware of the consequent danger of power politics and bureaucracy that this entails. Stalin's Russia is ever present as a dreadful warning. But there is no life without risk! Anyway certain factors unite greatly to diminish the risk of recurring "purges," "Moscow trials," etc., etc. We visualize throughout, an international revolution, in which the backwardness and isolation of Russia would necessarily be absent: those twin parents of the Stalinist abortion. Moreover, technically, and educationally, the new Social Order must progress far more rapidly than ever before, as a necessary result of the removal of all (capitalist) brakes on production. Proletarian robots are scarcely consonant with progress of so headlong a nature. Nevertheless, we

repeat that we know the risks, ever present, of that recurring phenomenon of retreat and betrayal known generically as "Thermidor." We know, and prefer the risk of revolutionary betrayal to the certainty of its only alternative, counter-revolutionary victory and consequent collective homicide and stagnation. Unhappily, it is not ever probable that a victorious revolutionary party will put into effect the heroic recipe for avoiding "Thermidor," as set forth by the veteran conspirator, August Blanqui, viz., to kill the revolutionaries en bloc on the morrow of the revolution! Doubtless, there is much to be said, in theory, for this remedy, which would have made Fouché and Stalin impossible! But it is hardly ever likely to be practical "politics." Until, and unless, the party represents an evil; but a *necessary* evil.

We conclude, then, in favor of the party as against the class: or rather, that the party is the necessary instrument of the class, *is*, indeed its personified class-consciousness and awareness of its historic mission: by overthrowing the old order it prepares the way for the new, by means of its revolutionary ethic it infuses new blood into the veins of a dying civilization, in the words with which Georges Sorel ends his famous work, it brings *Salvation* to the modern world.

IN REPLY TO RIDLEY

On the whole, Ridley's straight-forward article merely reinforces the points made by his party Comrade Maitland and there is nothing new to add to our own summing up in the original discussion. However, Ridley's specific formulation of the question offers a welcome opportunity to present the concept of the vanguard-power party in its true light as an anti-Marxist "idealist" historical formulation in basic contradiction to the class-struggle basis of Historical-Materialism.

Ridley out of a correct instiuct is at pains to establish his continued acceptance of the class-struggle basis of the Marxist interpretation of history. For the Marxist position is the correct, scientific and historically sustained position and every attempt to evaluate or influence history and social action outside of the mould of the class struggle is necessarily doomed to failure. But despite his demonstrative affirmation of the class struggle as the driving force of history, Ridley in concrete action negates and rejects this basic premise of Marxist historical science. For what else is he doing when he denies the potential revolutionary character of the proletariat and its capacity for self-emancipation, and posing the possibility of a proletarian revolution by a few choice and select idealist spirits, but negating the class-struggle premise of Marxism and introducing (through the back door to the accompaniment of a Marxist overture) the old discredited "idealist" conception of history with its emphasis upon ideas and great men the dominant historical factors? The fact of the matter is that Ridley in an effort to solve the "enigma" of the continued apathy, supineness and revolutionary impotence of the proletariat, has left the high ground of Marxist historical science and wound up in the swamps of the "idealistic" interpretation of history.

It will not avail Ridley in support of his concept of a dictatorial party to raise the point that it would be the class that would be functioning, carrying on the class struggle through the party which would be supplying political leadership and educational direction. The very concept of a dictatorial party negates the idea that the masses would be in a position to exercise any measure of control over or independence in relation to such a party. Historically, it has been proven by the experience of the Russian revolution that the mass is an inert, subjugated force under the reign of a dictatorial party.

Ridley's formulation that a slave class is incapable of self-emancipation overlooks entirely the actual functioning of past revolutionary classes. The bourgeoisie was in its inception (and for a long time under feudalism) a slave, oppressed class more so than the proletariat under capitalism.* Yet the bourgeoisie raised itself to the status of the ruling class. In comparison to the proletariat as a revolutionary class, the bourgeoisie possessed the inestimable boon of being a property-owning class. The fact that bourgeois property (capital) and its economic system of commodity production was in fundamental antagonism to the specific form of feudal property (land) and its system of production for use, drove the bourgeoisie to adopt its own independent class ideology consonant with the needs of capitalist commodity production. Equipped with a superior economic power and class-consciousness, the victory of the bourgeoisie was inevitable. The root source of the proletariat's class supineness and revolutionary impotence is to be found in its propertyless character and the peculiar historical circumstances accompanying the development of capitalism which prevented it from developing its own independent class ideology.†

It may be that the proletariat has missed the historical bus (this, however, is decidedly not our opinion) or that it has been historically conditioned with a bourgeois psychology to such an extent that it has become congenitally incapable of self-emancipation (which conclusion we also reject); but these positive premises would not establish Ridley's negative formulation that a dictatorial party is an indispensable pre-requisite for the establishment of Socialism. Ridley has signally failed to establish this contention. A final word of caution. In rejecting the Leninist-Maitland-Ridley concept of a dictatorial, vanguard-power party, we by no means reject the importance of working-class political action. The interested reader is referred to our article, *The Party and Consciousness*, for our position on this question. [EDITOR.]

* Engels calls the bourgeoisie: "Originally an oppressed estate liable to pay dues to the ruling feudal nobility, recruited from serfs and villeins of all kinds."—"*Anti-Durhing*," p. 187 (International Publishers edition).

† The reader is referred to Daniel DeLeon's Marxist classic, *Two Pages from Roman History*, for the original formulation of this interpretation. *Two Pages from Roman History* cannot be too highly recommended as a brilliant and original contribution to the literature of tactical Marxism. It is indispensable foundation reading for an understanding of the proletariat's lack of class-consciousness.

How Dead Is German Capitalism?

By Fred Dyer

Has the capitalist mode of production been superseded in Germany, by a new, bureaucratic-collectivist economic order, as contended by Abraham Ziegler (among others) writing in the Spring, 1942, issue of Modern Socialism. Lack of space prevents our dealing with more than certain of the premises upon which Ziegler bases his position.

Let us examine what exactly is the prevailing economy in Germany. According to Ziegler, "In September, 1936, Hitler announced the inauguration of a second four-year plan. Commodity production was abolished. Production was centralized under a uniform directing authority, with the aim of making Germany self-sufficient and independent of the world market."

That Ziegler is well aware, however, that the capitalists were not actually expropriated is testified to, among other things, by his demonstrative quotation of Goering: "Business must realize," wrote the latter in 1938, "that it lives in the last analysis only by accomplishing the great tasks entrusted to it and not by balancing accounts of profit and losses."

But Ziegler knows as well as any business man that business *does* in the last analysis live by balancing accounts of profit and losses. Any great tasks accomplished by business, and there have been many such since capitalism began to rise under the feudal régime, were possible of achievement only because of or incidentally to the minimizing of the use of red ink. And if the capitalists remain, does Ziegler really believe that commodity production can be "abolished" when the bourgeois relations of production, which are the necessary condition to the production of commodities, have not been eliminated? Lastly, as to the claim that production has been centralized under a uniform directing authority, does Ziegler mean the institution of planned production, or something akin to the American War Production Board? From his whole analysis of German conditions, he undoubtedly means the former. Thus we have a situation, according to Ziegler, where there exists a régime of planned production under a dominantly collectivist economy, while at the same time the dominant relations of production remain capitalist, both in that the productive forces are owned by the capitalists or, where the state has title to industrial units, financed by them in the main.

As a matter of fact, even before Hitler the German state took sick industries out of the hands of the capitalists, compensating them generously. Certain German capitalists and economists referred to this as the "socialization of losses." Here in America we have often heard the same cries to nationalize non-profitable industries, such as railroads or coal mines. On the other hand, after Hitler became dictator and the Nazi smashing of the labor movement permitted at least a temporary rise in the rate and mass of profit in Germany, *previously nationalized industrial concerns and banks were returned to private hands.*

Under capitalist relations of private appropriation of the profits of production, it is necessary that the profit motive exist. It is also necessary that the capitalists reinvest their accumulated capital. This situation obtains whether the individual capitalist operates on his own, or combines through banks, corporations, holding companies into cliques operating what Marx called a socialized capital. Under no circumstances can such a setup be equated with a planned production. Planned production, as Ziegler will admit and even contend, must come into conflict with the profit motive and therefore with the capitalist class.

What then are we to think of Goering's dire warning to the capitalists of Germany, so seriously quoted by Ziegler? The main thing to observe in Goering's statement is that the great tasks have been entrusted to business, that it is business which must accomplish them. Even if Goering does not know, or forgets, like Ziegler, that business accomplishes great and mean tasks only if they bring a profit, that is nevertheless the fact, which even dictators cannot abolish. If Hitlerism is concerned about the establishment of collectivist economy it must begin by altering the relationships of production. For if human-beings obey the commands of dictators, laws of economy do not.

Of course, Ziegler and others may argue that, after all, they do not claim that the Nazis can establish collectivism overnight, that there must be a transition period for the purpose, and that is what is happening in Germany today. To any such argument there is one fact in refutation. In the ninth year of the régime of Hitler, absolutely no step has been taken toward the expropriation of the capitalists and the establishment of socialized relations of production. Industrial units were nationalized before Hitler, and as we have seen, they were returned to private ownership afterward. In no case has any bank or corporation been nationalized without compensation, an economic necessity if a nationwide and industrywide scheme of nationalization is not to be killed in birth.

Recently one well-known case of a large capitalist being expropriated has been brought to light. The reference is to Thyssen. But (1) Thyssen has been expropriated only of his own personal shareholdings; (2) the steel trust remains as before under its old name as a private firm; and (3) even Thyssen's personal holdings and their fate is still in the realm of mystery, with but one clue existing in the fact that Hitler entrusted them to former associates of Thyssen, the capitalists whom Ziegler sees on the way out in Germany.

* * * *

Labor relations in Germany are decisively an aspect of the quasi-socialist or state capitalist measures that the capitalists must take to save capitalism. As in the other cases, here too the measures serve the interests of the capitalists, in this case against the proletariat. They indeed serve further to enslave the workers. This we can and must say again and again. We must do so because even without the prospect of an immediate introduction of fascism in the U. S., the proletariat here can expect similar blessings, like a draft of labor, the abolition of the right to strike, all kinds of hindrances to union activity, etc., etc.

But such further enslavement of the workers is not chattel slavery, or serfdom or peonage as existed in previous historical economies. Like the old vagrancy laws, anti-strike, anti-combination and maximum wage laws of early capitalism, they serve not to change wage slavery into something else, but to enhance that wage slavery. The draft of labor, in fact, is potentially and under certain circumstances a natural measure of a socialist economy. Under trade union control in a workers' state it can serve the interests of planned production and of the proletariat. The fact that Germany and Great Britain both resort to it is merely a sign of the need for socialist relations, and not a proof of their existence either in a democratic form or as a new version of chattel slavery under the state.

Servile labor is not possible as a decisive labor relation under capitalism or under any highly developed industrial economy. The handling of complicated machinery, etc., cannot be done in any permanent or important degree with serfs, slaves or prisoners. Sabotage and inefficient handling are inevitable and therefore capitalist accumulation cannot take place unless the worker is free, even if that means only that he may lose his job. Furthermore, the process of capitalist accumulation necessitates the extremes of attraction of new workers into industry and mass unemployment. An unemployed slave is a contradiction in terms. Thus the present draft in war-torn countries will give way, to the extent that it holds sway, to unemployment and competition for jobs.

Servile labor relations, mainly in the form of prison labor, which temporarily nullifies free wage labor relations, do exist in the German-dominated territories. Polish peasants and French prisoners of war are forced to work for Germans. In the main, however, they are put to tasks in which capital accumulation does not play an important role and where there is no technical organization, *e.g.*, as farm laborers with primitive labor methods. On the other hand, it is not excluded that conquered peoples may be drafted for work in the advanced industries of Germany, because of the dire labor shortage. Our own southern slaveholders attempted factory organization of slaves. But that such an attempt can be successful for anyone's purpose is excluded.

To the extent that actual servile conditions exist in the more backward countries conquered by Germany, this is only an example of how the German imperialists are introducing imperialist economic measures in Europe, which cannot sustain them as well as the territories of Asia and Africa, which up to now have been the main arenas of colonial endeavor. That those conditions exist is no more proof of the abolition of capitalism than the similiar practices of the British, French, Belgian and U. S. imperialists in the past and at present of enslaving colonial natives. Because it has been done in Europe and not in the wilds of Africa, or our own south, the capitalist world is shocked. We may indeed view this with horror, but let us save some horror for the natives of the Belgian Congo, the plantations of British Malaya and the coolies of China.

* * * *

In conclusion, for Germany the war is not one of world conquest, but of conquest of those countries small or backward enough to yield profits to the

German capitalists if they are taken over and monopolized. Nations like France, Britain and the U. S. do not fall into that category, because their industries are too advanced and widespread to serve as monopolized markets and sources of investment that do not compete decisively with the capitalists of the home country. To accomplish its objectives, however, Germany must fight other imperialist nations for the redivision of the colonial spoils. But that is also true of the other imperialist powers, whether, like Great Britain, they defend their timeworn empires, or, like the U. S., they must also fight to redivide the world.

A SECTARIAN MARXIST DISSECTED

The above discussion article is a contraction of a larger article which it was necessary to cut down because of technical and other considerations.

In the main, Dyer's contentions are dealt with extensively elsewhere in this issue.* We propose here to note briefly his non-Marxist approach to the problem involved. Dyer is completely confused on the nature of this basic Marxist category of social relationships. For our contributor "the dominant relations of production" are determined by the form of ownership. To him it is a startling contradiction for Ziegler to claim that "it is possible for a regime of planned production to exist under a dominant collectivist economy" while the capitalists still retain the ownership of the means of production. To those who (unlike Dyer) understand the elementary truism that the specific character of an economy is determined not by the *form* of ownership but by the nature of its social relationships, there is no contradiction involved here. What are social relationships?

As Marx put it:

> "In the work of production men have their effect not only on nature, but also on each other. They produce only by working together in a specified manner and mutually exchanging their activities. In order to produce they enter into definite relations and conditions, and it is only within these relations and conditions that they have their influence upon nature and production is made possible.
>
> "These social relations upon which the producers mutually enter, the terms upon which they exchange their activities and take their share in the collective act of production, will naturally vary according to the character of the means of production."†

Marx, it will be noted, does not speak at all of the *form* of ownership. Thus we see that Dyer's conception of what constitutes "social relationship" is entirely at variance with Marx. If mere private ownership of the means of production constituted capitalism, then the feudal lord and the chattel slaveowner

* *"Capitalist" Property in Germany*, infra, p. 15.

† *Wage Labor and Capital* (Kerr edition), p. 33.

would also have been capitalists, a manifest absurdity which even Dyer will not undertake to defend.

In an attempt to meet the point that "free" labor no longer exists in Germany Dyer enters what lawyers term a plea of confession and avoidance. He admits that labor has been "further enslaved" in Germany but seeks to avoid the effect of this admission by contending that such further enslavement "is not chattel slavery, or serfdom, or peonage." But who said it was? The worker in Nazi Germany is a state slave—a collective, peculiar and historical distinctive form of labor enslavement. In an attempt to controvert our position that "free" wage labor in the Marxian sense no longer exists in Germany, Dyer informs us that servile labor is incompatible with an cannot exist under a highly developed industrial order. Inasmuch as Germany is a highly developed industrial order and production is still being carried on, we are left to draw the conclusion that "free" labor continues to exist there. Here once more we have the manifest absurdity that the inexorable logic of Dyer's untenable position leads him into. Dyer dare not deny that "free" wage labor is a necessary pre-requisite of capitalist production: at the same time he cannot afford to admit the obvious fact that such "free" labor no longer exists in Germany, for that would completely dispose of his contention that capitalism still continues to function there. In an attempt to extricate himself from this predicament Dyer points to the fact that in the United States and Great Britain too, labor is being "further enslaved"; this he contends is no more proof of the abolition of capitalism in these countries than it is for Germany. There are none so blind as those who will not see. In our essay on Totalitarianism we pointed out that Bureaucratic-Collectivism was not a peculiar German, Russian or Italian social malady but was a universal product of a decadent capitalism which had its economic roots in the phenomenon of socialized capital. The same social forces which culminated in Bureaucratic-Collectivism in Germany are at work in the United States and Great Britain and they are producing the same effects and leading to the same culmination. That Dyer prefers to close his eyes to these social forces and their significance and merely sees in them proof that capitalism still flourishes in Germany as it does in the United States does not change the facts in issue.

Today, when the capitalist class has been completely superseded in Germany as the controlling force in the economy, and the power necessities of the Nazi state, not the average rate of profit, is the regulator of the productive forces, Dyer and the rest of the Church of sectarian Marxism continue to bleat on that nothing essential has changed, capitalism continues to rule in Germany. We must once more borrow an analogy from Marx. Perseus wore a magic cap that the monsters he hunted might not see him. Dyer draws the magic cap down over eyes and ears as a make-believe that there are no monsters.¶ [EDITOR.]

¶ We of course reject Dyer's bracketing of United States-British Democratic-Imperialism together with Nazi Imperialism. Nazism is the main and immediate enemy of the working class and must be destroyed at the roots.

PSYCHOLOGY VERSUS MARXISM

(*Continued from page* 9)

order of capitalist production. Feudalism and its political absolutism held the bourgeoisie in check and fettered the expanding forces of bourgeois production—the Catholic Church proclaimed the divine right of monarchy. Feudalism had no conception of the primacy of work as an aim in itself, nor the passion for thrift, its very nature was stepped in ostentation and display—the Catholic Church encouraged idleness by setting up numerous religious holidays to be celebrated with ostentation and display, and it refused to recognize that work possessed any inherent moral virtue. Feudal juridical concepts by treating landed property as superior to bourgeois personal property and exempting landed property from legal processes placed an undue burden on bourgeoisie forms of property, which served as an additional barrier to its development—the Catholic Church was "by far the most powerful feudal lord, holding as it did fully one-third of the soil of the Catholic world." Protestantism was the answer of the rising bourgeoisie to these feudal (Catholic Church) restrictions, barriers and obstacles, to the free and full development of its own system of production. The need of the rising capitalist class for political democracy, for a new conception of moral values and ethics which recognized the supreme moral virtue of work, for new juridical conceptions which placed bourgeois property on an equal plane with landed property, was reflected in the altered religious teachings of Protestantism. The Reformation was not an independent psychological causative agent of the capitalist revolution, but rather an *effect* of the inner ideological needs and necessities of nascent capitalist production.

* * * *

Fromm's psychoanalysis of Fascism (Nazism) stands up no better than his ill-fated attempt to psychoanalyze the Reformation and deny its sole, primary economic basis.[9] For his psychological examination of Nazism he borrows directly from the laboratory of Freudian psychoanalysis and its study of individual consciousness and neurosis, its drives, complexes and frustrations. Answering in advance criticism of his methodology in importing the phenomenon of individual consciousness into the study of *social* consciousness, Fromm cites the analogy of the physical sciences which study individual species under a microscope and draw general conclusions therefrom. Here, once again Fromm confuses biology and natural history with social history. In biology the individual of the particular species and his physical characteristics is the object of scientific study and research, consequently the microscope is indis-

[9] It may be noted that Fromm brands in advance our analysis of the Reformation and the stressing of the economic factor of the needs of bourgeois production as a pseudo-Marxian viewpoint (p. 296). But we are nothing loath. If this view is pseudo-Marxist, then we are in excellent Marxist company, for we are merely following the lead of Frederick Engels, who was the co-discoverer with Marx of the Materialist Conception of history. Engels considered the Reformation to be but a religious disguise in the battle of the rising bourgeoisie against feudal absolutism and its ideology which restricted the development of capitalist production. Cf. *Ludwig Feurbach* (International Publishers), pp. 67-68, and *Historical Materialism*, appendice, published in *Anti-Durhing* (Kerr edition), pp. 353, 354, 355.

pensable in this field. But human nature and social history, as Marx pointed out, does not possess an individual essence, but on the contrary represents an *ensemble* of social relations. The abstract individual can only function as a member of a particular class or group. Social classes cannot be studied under the microscope and neither can the laws of individual consciousness be fruitfully employed in analyzing the phenomenon of social consciousness.

According to Fromm the psychical basis of Fascism[10] is to be found in the widespread feeling of moral aloneness, isolation and individual insignificance and powerlessness which took possession of the great majority of the German people after Germany's defeat in the first World War and the imposition of the Versailles Treaty. The negative, ebbing freedom of decadent capitalism became an intolerable burden. An overwhelming urge arose within the individual to surrender this deceptive freedom and "dissolve into an overwhelming strong power and participate in its strength and glory." Fromm designates this psychological urge as the expression of a Masochism personality. Complementing this Masochism personality there is the Sadist-Masochism personality, represented by Hitler, which covets unrestrained power over others more or less destructive. The synthesis of these two abnormal psychological personalities gives rise to the authoritarian character which has had numerous historical manifestations and which during our own epoch takes on the specific form of Totalitarianism. Fromm analyzes with considerable skill the anti-freedom neurosis of the declassed middle-class elements who formed the mass basis of the Nazi party. While the so-called Masochistic personality may explain the mass base of Nazism, it was not the support of the middle class that was the decisive factor in promoting the victory of Nazism. Fromm himself makes this clear.[11] However, big business was able to assure the victory of the Nazi party only because of the default and impotence of the working class. It was because the workers missed the bus, in the first place, defaulting their historical mission of superseding the bourgeoisie, that big business and its Junker allies had the "disposal" of the situation. The apathy, discouragement and general feeling of hopelessness, that gradually took possession of the German workers and which Fromm stresses, were undoubtedly important psychological factors, but they were not of primary importance. They constituted an effect and were not a cause. The apathy and discouragement of the workers proceeded from their political defeat and the proven incapacity of their leadership, political and economic. This defeat and incapacity in turn was not the result of mysterious Freudian psychological drives of complexes and inhibitions, but was the product of the proletariat's subservience to bourgeois consciousness, its lack of an independent, Socialist consciousness

[10] Fromm acknowledges "That these psychological conditions were not the basic cause of Nazism. They constituted its human basis without which Nazism could not have developed, but any analysis of the whole phenomenon of the rise and victory of Nazism must deal with the strictly economic and political as well as the psychological conditions." P. 218.

[11] "Without their support [big business and the Junkers] Hitler could never have won, and their support was rooted in their understanding of their economic interests much more than in psychological factors." Page 213.

and revoluntary, working class political and economic organization.[12] It is this hold of bourgeois consciousness upon the proletariat and the role of their capitalist-lieutenant labor leaders, and not the psychological abnormalities of the middle class which supplied the "human basis" for the victory of Nazism.

• • • •

In denying the Frommian thesis that the individual embodying certain inherent psychological-biological qualities is the basic entity[13] of the social process, we do not reject psychology and ideology as direct and potent historical forces. In the case of Fascism, unquestionably the psychological reaction of the German proletariat—its apathy, revolutionary weariness and discouragement, played the major role in preparing the way for the victory of Fascism. We have no quarrel with Fromm in stressing the psychological factor in evaluating the forces behind the victory of Fascism. The point at issue between us is: what was the basis, the origins, of this psychological weariness? Was it as Fromm would have us believe, an expression of certain inherent, psychological-biological qualities operating independently of social forces, or was it an ideological reflection of the ebb of the class struggle between contending social forces? Fromm himself, gives us the answer to the problem here posed. He recognizes that the German proletariat's apathy and discouragement arose out of the post-war defeats that it sustained and out of the proven incapacity of its leaders. This being so, unless Fromm is prepared to contend that the defeat of the proletariat was due to a congenital incapacity to resist Fascism, growing out of ingrained and inherent biological drives, his conception of an individual human nature independent of social forces falls to the ground, in the case of Fascism as well as the Reformation. *Fromm makes no such claim.* We have already pointed out the social basis of the proletariat's defeat.

We have dwelt at great length on Fromm's attempt to re-introduce an idealistic (individual) conception of history in a psychological garb because, in our opinion, it represents the most ambitious, ingenious and superficially plausible effort yet made in this direction. It has been necessary to probe below the seemingly scientific foundation erected by Fromm to lay bare the essentially bourgeois, unscientific basis of his psychological formulations. Fromm's rejection (in the name of scientific psychology) of the class struggle as the basic social entity in the struggle against Fascism; his dismissal of the social causes responsible for the defeat of the German proletariat and the triumph of Fascism, and his distorted emphasis upon the psychological factors, befogs and beclouds the real issues involved and thereby ideologically weakens the struggle against Fascism. Nothwithstanding its dangerous and unscientific thesis, *Escape from Freedom* is a significant and stimulating contribution to recent social thought.

---

[12] The German Social-Democracy, because of the backward political conditions of Germany and the incompletion of the bourgeois revolution, was compelled early in its career to become a party of bourgeois liberalism and devote itself to the task of completing the bourgeois revolution. Thus, while retaining its Marxist terminology to the end, it became more and more bourgeoisfied. The German trade union movement was in *action* every whit as conservative and capitalist in nature as the American Federation of Labor.

[13] "The basic entity of the social process is the individual, his desires, his fears, his passions and reason, his propensities for good and evil." (Foreword.)

A SECOND YEAR FOR "MODERN SOCIALISM"!

The continued publication of a Socialist Journal in war time is, of course, politically uncertain. Aside from the question of political uncertainty, whether or not MODERN SOCIALISM will continue publication for a second year, depends in a large measure upon the financial support we receive from our readers and friends in the shape of contributions to the Publication Fund and new and renewed subscriptions. A number of subscriptions are expiring with this issue, and it is imperative that they be renewed if we are to continue with a second year for MODERN SOCIALISM. But new subscriptions, and, more particularly support for the Publication Fund, is also necessary.

Publication of the first year of MODERN SOCIALISM was made possible by the very generous financial help contributed by a small group of the publisher's co-workers and comrades. Economic dislocation brought on by the war has cut down sharply the income received from this source, and it becomes necessary to appeal to our readers and friends to fill the gap.

Help make certain a second year for MODERN SOCIALISM and its vital work of revolutionary re-education by:

(1) Sending in a contribution (however modest) to the Publication Fund.

(2) Renewing your subscription.

(3) Sending in a new subscription.

PUBLISHER.

MODERN SOCIALISM,

140 Fourth Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Enclosed find $1.00, for which please enter my subscription to MODERN SOCIALISM.

Enclosed please find $_____ as a contribution to the Publication Fund.

*Name*_____

*Address*_____

*City*_____ *State*_____